

2



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

3

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/864,119	05/24/2001	David Paul Kuiken	AUS920010308US1	1470

35525 7590 09/22/2004

IBM CORP (YA)
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC
P.O. BOX 802333
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER

KE, PENG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

2

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/864,119	Applicant(s) KUIKEN ET AL.	
	Examiner Peng Ke	Art Unit 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 6/15/2004.
2. Claims 1-39 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 9, 17, 27, 30, 35, 37, 38, and 39 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 17, 18, and 27-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Van Weels et al. (US 5,631,825)

As per claim 17, Van Weele teaches a method for presenting messages in a field containing a plurality of messages, comprising:

receiving a plurality of messages, wherein each message has associated therewith an identifier (fig 31, item 268);

categorizing the messages by identifier (fig 31, item “PCC name”),

sorting the messages by chronology, whereby messages with the same identifier appear in chronological order (col. 45, lines 35-58); and

presenting the messages in a field (col. 42, lines 10-23; Examiner interprets “Alarm abbreviation” to be text filed).

As per claim 18, Van Weele teaches the method of claim 17, wherein the plurality of messages comprise text messages and the field is a text field (col. 42, lines 10-23; Examiner interprets "Alarm abbreviation" to be text filed).

As per claim 27, it is rejection with the same rationale as claim 17. (see rejection above)

As per claim 28, Van Weele teaches the apparatus of claim 27, wherein the insertion means comprises means for inserting the message into the field in ascending order based on the identifier (col. 45, lines 35-58).

As per claim 29, Van Weele teaches the apparatus of claim 27, wherein the insertion means comprises means for inserting the message into the field in descending order based on the identifier (col. 43, lines 33-60; Items "Event Type", "Ascending", and "Descending").

As per claim 30, Van Weele teaches the apparatus of claim 27, wherein the insertion means comprises means for inserting the message after a previous message with the same identifier, whereby messages with the same identifier appear in chronological order (col. 45, lines 35-58).

As per claim 31, Van Weele teaches the apparatus of claim 27, wherein the identifier comprises an identification and a sub identification (col. 42, lines 10-23; Examiner interprets "SEQUENCE" to be the sub identification).

As per claim 32, Van Weele teaches the apparatus of claim 27, wherein the presentation means comprises means for scrolling the field so that the message is visible (col. 45, lines 36-45).

As per claim 33, Van Weele teaches the apparatus of claim 27, wherein the event message comprises a text message and the field is a text field (col. 42, lines 10-23; Examiner interprets "Alarm abbreviation" to be text filed).

As per claim 34, Van Weele teaches the apparatus of claim 27, wherein the event message includes at least one of sound data, image data, and video data (col. 45, lines 58-63, col. 46, lines 1-8).

As per claim 35, it is rejected with the same rationale as claim 17. (see rejection above)

As per claim 36, which is dependent on claim 35, it is of the same scope as claim 33. (see rejection above)

As per claim 37, it is rejected with the same rationale as claim 17. (see rejection above)

As per claim 38, it is rejected with the same rationale as claim 17. (see rejection above)

As per claim 39, it is rejected with the same rationale as claim 17. (see rejection above)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-16, and 19- 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Weele (US. 5,631,825) in view of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (AAPA).

As per claim 1, Van Weele teaches a method for generating an event monitoring display, comprising:

receiving an event message, wherein the event message has associated therewith an identifier (col. 45, lines 35-58);

inserting the event message into a field based on the identifier (col. 42, lines 10-24; Examiner interprets PCC to be identifier);

presenting the field (col. 45, lines 35-58) ; and

However, Van Weele fails to teaches

automatically scrolling the field so that the event message is visible.

AAPA teaches method automatically scrolling the field so that the event message is visible (page 1, line 11-21)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include AAPA's teaching with method of Van Weele in order to allow the new message to be visible to the administrator.

As per claim 2, Van Weele et al. and AAPA teach the method of claim 1. Van Weele teaches wherein the step of inserting the event message into the field comprises inserting the event message into the field in ascending order based on the identifier (col. 43, lines 33-60; Items "Event Type", "Ascending", and "Descending").

As per claim 3, Van Weele et al. and AAPA teach the method of claim 1. Van Weele further teaches the method wherein the step of inserting the event message into the field comprises inserting the event message into the field in descending order based on the identifier (col. 43, lines 33-60; Items "Event Type", "Ascending", and "Descending").

As per claim 4, Van Weele et al. and AAPA teach the method of claim 1. Van Weele further teaches the method wherein the step of inserting the event message into the field comprises inserting the event message after a previous message with the same identifier, whereby messages with the same identifier appear in chronological order (col. 45, lines 35-58).

As per claim 5, Van Weele et al. and AAPA teach the method of claim 1, Van Weele further teaches the method wherein the step of inserting the event message into the field comprises inserting the event message before a previous message with the same identifier, whereby messages with the same identifier appear in reverse chronological order (col. 43, lines 33-60; Items "Event Type", "Ascending", and "Descending").

As per claim 6, Van Weele et al. and AAPA teach the method of claim 1, wherein the identifier comprises an identification and a sub identification (col. 42, lines 10-23; Examiner interprets "SEQUENCE" to be the sub identification).

As per claim 7, Van Weele et al. and AAPA teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the event message comprises a text message and the field is a text field (col. 42, lines 10-23; Examiner interprets "Alarm abbreviation" to be text filed).

As per claim 8, Van Weele et al. and AAPA teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the event message includes at least one of sound data, image data, and video data (col. 45, lines 58-63, col. 46, lines 1-8),

As per claim 9, it is rejected with the same rationale as claim 1. (see rejection above)

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 9, it is of the same scope as claim 2. (see rejection above)

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 9, it is of the same scope as claim 3. (see rejection above)

As per claim 12, which is dependent on claim 9, it is of the same scope as claim 4. (see rejection above)

As per claim 13, which is dependent on claim 9, it is of the same scope as claim 6. (see rejection above)

As per claim 14, Van Weele et al. and AAPA teaches the method of claim 9. Van Weele teaches wherein the step of presenting the field comprises scrolling the field so that the message is visible (col. 45, lines 36-45).

As per claim 15, which is dependent on claim 9, it is of the same scope as claim 7. (see rejection above)

As per claim 16, which is dependent on claim 9, it is of the same scope as claim 8. (see rejection above)

As per claim 19, it is rejected with the same rationale as claim 1. (see rejection above)

As per claim 20, which is dependent on claim 19, it is of the same scope as claim 2. (see rejection above)

As per claim 21, which is dependent on claim 20, it is of the same scope as claim 3. (see rejection above)

As per claim 22, which is dependent on claim 19, it is of the same scope as claim 4. (see rejection above).

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 23, which is dependent on claim 19, it is of the same scope as claim 5. (see rejection above)

As per claim 24, which is dependent on claim 19, it is of the same scope as claim 6. (see rejection above)

As per claim 25, which is dependent on claim 19, it is of the same scope as claim 7. (see rejection above)

As per claim 26, which is dependent on claim 19, it is of the same scope as claim 8. (see rejection above)

Response to Argument

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 6/15/04 have been considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peng Ke whose telephone number is (571) 272-4062. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and Alternate Fridays 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2174

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Peng Ke

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100